



General Certificate of Education

Health and Social Care 8621/8623

**HC08 Needs and Provision for Early
Years Clients**

Report on the Examination

2007 examination - June series

Further copies of this Report are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2007 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723) and a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334). Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX
Dr Michael Cresswell Director General.

HC08 Needs and Provision for Early Years Clients

Principal Moderator's Report

This unit generated a wide range of candidate response as may be expected when both local provision and candidate ability are taken into account.

More able candidates successfully organised their evidence in the four sections indicated by the specification. This ensured the assessment criteria were adhered to closely and, therefore, candidates could access higher marks.

However, too many candidates presented disorganised work which lacked structure and detail. Candidates should be encouraged to present the evidence in the same order of the assessment criteria.

Candidates are required to choose an age range within the early years spectrum. There is no restriction on what this may be as it was intended to facilitate candidates' local circumstances. Most candidates did select a chosen age range, but the evidence presented was often generic and did not specifically relate to the chosen range.

Higher-ability candidates did show clear knowledge and understanding of the needs of children within the chosen age range. Work in this range also included quotes on developmental needs from experts.

In other portfolios, there was a significant amount of misinterpretation of the assessment criteria.

Some candidates described norms of development and ignored the 'needs' of the age range selected.

Another common misinterpretation was that candidates did not select an age range, but studied one child instead and the evidence drifted away from the assessment criteria and became a child study.

Candidates are expected to look at a range of local provision and explain how this meets the needs of the age range.

Higher-ability candidates produced evidence which described provision directly related to the age range under review.

However, some candidates described provision generally and had not investigated what would be realistically accessed locally. Other candidates described provision which would not be appropriate to the selected age range, e.g. playgroups were described when the age range selected was 5-7 year olds.

Candidates should be guided to be selective in the evidence they present and ensure it is realistic and relevant.

Higher-ability candidates carried out thorough research to analyse provision within the local area. This information was gathered from a wide range of sources and more organised candidates tabulated the responses.

Some mid-range to lower-ability candidates included down-loaded information and prospectuses from nurseries etc.

There was sometimes little evidence of candidates' own work. Candidates should be guided to carry out independent research and include other information in an appendix.

The evaluation section of the work proved to be challenging for a significant number of candidates.

It is important that candidates do not attempt to evaluate in terms of quality of provision as they are not in a position to do so and this could result in consequent access problems in the future.

Candidates should consider the local provision in terms of the providers and the clients and consider the relative advantage of formal and informal care.

Candidates could also include evaluative evidence on how services can be accessed, developed and/or delivered, in order to meet local needs, both now and in the future. Barriers to service access and how these may be reduced or removed may also be included.

It is important that candidates follow the assessment criteria carefully. If they do not describe the needs of the age range at the beginning of the portfolio, the remainder of the criteria are difficult to access.